

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action issued January 8, 2008, claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Day, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,763,356 (Day) in view of Kennedy et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,651,217 (Kennedy).

Claims 1-15 are now pending in this application. Claims 1 and 3 were amended in order to clarify the subject matter that the Applicant considers to be the invention. No new matter has been added.

The present invention is not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, the references relied upon in the Office Action, as the prior art references do not disclose or suggest the claimed features of the present invention.

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-15 are not unpatentable over Day in view of Kennedy. The combination of Day and Kennedy does not disclose or suggest storing corresponding attribute data defining a different set of data entry fields for each of the plurality of data values or displaying the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the set of data entry fields, as required by claims 1 and 3. The combination of Day and Kennedy only discloses displaying the same data entry fields regardless of the data value entered into a data entry field.

Day discloses that when a user (purchaser) wishes to enter a value in a field, such as model field 41, the field is highlighted and a menu of predefined entries, such as tool 40, is displayed. To "fill in" field 41, all the user needs to do is to point to one of the entries 42 through 46 in tool 40. What varies based on the value of the model field is the values of the entries 42 through 46 in tool 40. Day does not disclose or suggest that the

particular fields that are displayed varies. As a result, Day does not disclose or suggest displaying the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the set of data entry fields. Likewise, Day does not disclose or suggest storing corresponding attribute data defining a different set of data entry fields for each of the plurality of data values.

Even when Day is combined with Kennedy, the resulting combination still does not disclose the present invention as claimed. Kennedy discloses monitoring form fields to determine whether values have been entered into all the fields of the form or whether some fields are empty. Kennedy, at col. 6, lines 38-61, discloses that one technique for obtaining an initial set of data values to be used for populating subsequent forms is to prompt the user to view and complete an "autofill profile" the first time a form is used. If the browser determines that no autofill profile has been created for the user, then when the user attempts to submit the completed form, profile generator function 205c extracts the name, address, and phone number entered by the user, fills out the corresponding fields in autofill profile 203 by matching field labels in form 250 with those in autofill profile 203, and prompts the user to fill in missing data items such as e-mail. Kennedy does not disclose or suggest that the particular fields that are displayed vary. As a result, Day does not disclose or suggest displaying the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the set of data entry fields. Likewise, Day does not disclose or suggest storing corresponding attribute data defining a different set of data entry fields for each of the plurality of data values.

Thus, even when Day and Kennedy are combined, the resulting combination still fails to disclose or suggest the requirements of claims 1 and 3, of storing corresponding attribute data defining a different set of data entry fields for each of the plurality of data values or displaying the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the set of data entry fields.

Therefore, the present invention according to claims 1 and 3, and according to claims 2, and 4-15, which depend therefrom, are not unpatentable over Day in view of Kennedy.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.